

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/551,117	09/28/2005	Giovanni Maria Carlomagno	021500-141	4346	
21839 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			SZEWCZYK, CYNTHIA		
ALEXANDRI	A, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1791		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/12/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com offserv@bipc.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/551,117	CARLOMAGNO, GIOVANNI MARIA	
Examiner	Art Unit	
CYNTHIA SZEWCZYK	1791	

	CYNTHIA SZEWCZYK	1791		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be variable under the provisions of 37 CFT 135(3). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after Six (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period or reply is spaceful above, the macumum statutory period will apply and will copies SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Faiture to reply within the set or extended period for reply with by statute, cause the application to become ABMO/CDE (35 U.Sc. § 133). and pattern that the set of extended period for reply with gradient provided in the province of timely filed, may reduce any cannot period them.				
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Ag 2a This action is FINAL. 2b This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. uce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is	
·				
Disposition of Claims 4)				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage	
Attachment(s)				

Attac	hment	(s
-------	-------	----

- Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ___

D (4	Interview Summary (PTO-413
	Paper No(s)/Mail Date

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other:

Art Unit: 1791

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FRANK et al. (US 5,507,852) in view of BLACK (US 2,921,411).

FRANK teaches an apparatus for tempering a bent glass sheet, comprising means for conveying the bent glass sheet (col. 2, lines 41-42) and a pair of blastheads (42 and 44 in figure 1). The blastheads comprise upper (42 in figure 1) and lower blastheads (44 in figure 1), wherein each blasthead comprises a plurality of spaced elongated plenums (52 in figure 2) and wherein the plenums extend transversely to the direction of conveyance of the bent glass sheet (see figure 2). The plenums contain an array of quench nozzles (58 in figure 2). Figure 2 shows that the nozzle bars contain two rows of nozzles (holes in figure), however, FRANK also discloses that the plenum may contain one row of individual nozzles extending from the plenum (col. 3 lines 56-59). Figure 2 shows that the quench nozzles of each plenum are mutually inclined to provide diverging jets of quench gas and that each array of quench nozzles is curved in at least one direction. Figure 2 shows space between each plenum, which would

Art Unit: 1791

provide side access between plenums. FRANK discloses that the nozzle bar has nozzle holes that extend from the surface (58) through the plenum (55) to communicate with the air openings (51) (col. 3 lines 51-56); however, FRANK does not explicitly state that the nozzle bars having a length exceeding their diameter.

BLACK teaches an apparatus for chilling bent glass. BLACK teaches that the apparatus comprises nozzle bars (figure 10). Figure 11 shows that the nozzles are connected to an air source having a length exceeding their diameter. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the nozzle bar of FRANK could have had a similar construction because BLACK discloses that this set up allows for different inclination of the nozzles and may be adjusted based on the curvature of the glass (co. 6 lines 56-60).

Regarding claim 2, figure 2 of FRANK shows that the array of quench nozzles (58) comprises rows of quench nozzles extending along lines which are curved in the direction of elongation of the plenums.

Regarding claim 3, FRANK discloses that the rows of quench nozzles are curved to match the curvature of the bent glass sheet and are curved in a direction that is the same as the bent glass sheet (col. 3, lines 59-63).

Regarding claim 4, FRANK discloses that the plenums may be arranged longitudinally, in the direction of conveyance (col. 4 lines 55-57).

Regarding claim 5, see the discussion of claim 3 above.

Art Unit: 1791

Regarding claim 6, BLACK discloses that the nozzles may be arranged so that they are movable towards and away from each other to adjust for the curvature of the glass (col. 6 lines 57-60).

Regarding claim 7, figures 2 and 3a-d of KRANK show that the plenums are attached by a connecting surface (48, 148, 248, 348, 448). FRANK discloses that the connecting surface may be tapered in various directions (col. 4 lines 47-53), which obviously would include tapering in a direction away from the center line.

Regarding claim 8, see the discussion of claim 7. The arrangement of the upper blast heads would be a mirror image of the bottom blast heads, therefore if the tapering in the bottom blast heads were in a direction away from the center line, the tapering in the top blast heads would be in a direction towards the centerline.

Regarding claim 9, figure 2 of FRANK shows that the quench nozzles are formed as bores in a nozzle bar (58), and figure 2 also shows that the outlets of the nozzles are level with a surface of the bar.

 Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FRANK et al. (US 5,507,852) in view of BLACK (US 2,921,411) as applied to claims 1-9 above, and further in view of MASUHIDE (JP 2000-247633).

FRANK as modified by BLACK teaches an apparatus for tempering a bent glass sheet with air quenching. Modified FRANK is silent to the shape of the nozzle bores.

Art Unit: 1791

MASUHIDE teaches a bed structure for providing glass sheets with an air support. Figure 3 of MASUHIDE shows that the holes are part cylindrical (20) and conical (23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the bore of modified FRANK could have had the shape of the air discharge hole of MASUHIDE because modified FRANK simply requires that the bores supply air through openings (col. 3, lines 45-48), which MASUHIDE would accomplish.

Regarding claim 11, figure 2 of MASUHIDE shows that the length of the cylindrical part of the bore (20) is greater than the length of the conical part (23).

Regarding claim 12, MASUHIDE teaches that the material of the bores, and in turn the bar, may be a heat resistant ceramic (trans. para. 0024).

4. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FRANK et al. (US 5,507,852) in view of BLACK (US 2,921,411) as applied to claims 1-9 above, and further in view of FUNK et al. (US 2006/0277947 A1).

Modified FRANK teaches an apparatus for tempering a bent glass sheet with air quenching. Modified FRANK is silent to the shape of the nozzle bores.

FUNK teaches a bed structure for providing glass sheets with an air support. Figure 5 of FUNK shows that the holes are part cylindrical (18) and conical (16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the bore of modified FRANK could have had the shape of the air discharge hole of FUNK because modified FRANK simply requires that the bores supply air through openings (col. 3, lines 45-48), which FUNK would accomplish.

Art Unit: 1791

Regarding claim 11, figure 5 of FUNK shows that the length of the cylindrical part of the bore (18) is greater than the length of the conical part (16).

Regarding claim 12, FUNK teaches that the material of the surface, and in turn the bar, may be a ceramic (para. 0042).

 Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FRANK et al. (US 5,507,852) in view of BLACK (US 2,921,411) as applied to claims 1-9 above, and further in view of RHONEHOUSE (US 4,297,121).

FRANK as modified by BLACK teaches an apparatus for tempering a bent glass sheet with air quenching using nozzle bars. Modified FRANK is silent to the use of polytetrafluoroethene.

RHONEHOUSE teaches that Teflon (also known as polytetrafluoroethene) may be used in glass manufacturing processes because it is heat resistant and it reduces wear on glass manufacturing apparatuses (col. 5, lines 14-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Teflon could have been used as the material of the bar because it is a heat-resistant material able to withstand temperatures of heated glass.

 Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FRANK et al. (US 5,507,852) in view of BLACK (US 2,921,411) as applied to claims 1-9 above, and further in view of MCMASTER et al. (US 4,515,622).

Art Unit: 1791

FRANK as modified by BLACK teaches an apparatus for tempering a bent glass sheet with air quenching. Modified FRANK is silent to the arrangement of the nozzle outlets of the nozzle bar.

MCMASTER teaches a glass sheet quench with oppositely angled jets.

MCMASTER teaches that the quench means may be a nozzle bar with holes

provided for discharging quenching gas (col. 3 lines 23-27). MCMASTER

teaches that the holes extend in opposite angular directions (col. 3 lines 35-38).

MCMASTER teaches that this is advantageous to provide a staggered

arrangement of nozzles in order to provide a uniform pattern on the glass sheet

(col. 4 lines 20-23) and also reduces pressure buildup of spent quenching gas

and provides an energy efficient quench (col. 2 lines 28-33). It would have been

obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art to use a staggered nozzle pattern in the

nozzle bar of modified FRANK discloses that it is important to accurately control

the gas flow during quenching (col. 4 lines 58-64) which MCMASTER would help

accomplish.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see pages 7-8, filed April 23, 2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-3 and 9 under FRANK have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of BLACK.

Art Unit: 1791

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CYNTHIA SZEWCZYK whose telephone number is (571)270-5130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 7:30 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on (571) 272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven P. Griffin/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791